

**REMARKS**

This Preliminary Amendment accompanies a Request for Continued Examination, and is a response to the Final Office Action of May 30, 2006, Applicant has carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the above-identified application. In light of this consideration, Applicant believes that the claims as now amended are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims now pending in the application.

In the first office action claim 9 was objected to. Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 6-7, 13-14, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin (EP 0829933) in view of Nelson (US 5,151,718). Claims 2-4, 8, 10-11, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and further in view of Rajeswaran (US 5,917,524). Claims 5, 9, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and Rajeswaran and further in view of Kamimura (US 6,266,077). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and further in view of Kamimura. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and further in view of Ema et al. (US 6,118,798).

In this the second office action, claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin (EP 0829933) in view of Kunnunaho et al. (US 6,603,498). Claims 2-4, 8, 10-11, and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Kunnunaho and further in view of Rajeswaran (US 5,917,524). Claims 5, 9, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Kunnunaho and Rajeswaran and further in view of Kamimura (US 6,266,077). Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Kunnunaho and further in view of Kamimura. Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Kunnunaho and further in view of Ema et al. (US 6,118,798).

Claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin (EP 0829933) in view of Kunnunaho et al. (US 6,603,498). The Examiner has indicated that the Applicant's previously submitted arguments are considered moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The Applicant must respectfully traverse. However the Applicant will none-the-less will explain these arguments within the context of the new grounds of rejection, i.e. Guerin and Kunnunaho. The Applicant's argument is that neither Guerin or Kunnunaho, in combination or alone, teach the employment of calibration uniformity values based on calibration at the surface of the photoreceptor, which used in combination with a photodetector array as a sensing source into programmable drivers combined with their feedback loops to adjust light beams and thus to ultimately obtain the desired nominal values of light intensity on the surface of the photoreceptor.

As stated by the Examiner in the office action, Guerin fails to teach "calibrated uniformity values corresponding to each light beam for a normal value of intensity on the surface of the photoreceptor". For this teaching reliance is made upon Kunnunaho. However, Kunnunaho also fails to provide this teaching. While Kunnunaho provides a calibration value as provided at the photodetector, it does not teach a calibration uniformity value corresponding to the intensity of the beam on a photoreceptor. This is understandable as Kunnunaho is directed to the writing of organically covered metal plates or thermal plates (see column 1, lines 12-18). Support for this teaching as claimed by the Applicant may be found at paragraph 19 of the Application, the pertinent part being excerpted here:

.....One method used to obtain calibration values is to first turn all the beams 32 "ON" and close the switch S1 44 shown in FIG. 5. Next, the intensity of each beam 18 at the photo detector plane 64 is either manually or automatically calibrated for a nominal value on the surface of the photoreceptor 20.....

Further it is believed that the claims as now amended overcome the Guerin reference as well. Allowance of claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 8, 10-11, and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 5, 9, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable. Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable. Since claims 2-5, 8-12, 15-18, and 20 are based upon claims deemed allowable they should be allowable too. Allowance of claims 2-5, 8-12, 15-18, and 20, is respectfully requested.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment; however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

It is respectfully submitted that the present set of claims, as amended, are patentably distinct over the cited references. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher D. Wait/

Christopher D. Wait  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 43,230  
Telephone (585) 423-6918

October 30, 2006  
CDW/fsl  
Xerox Corporation  
Xerox Square 20A  
Rochester, New York 14644